UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,923	09/22/2006	Venkatram P Shastri	RCHP-128US	4606
23122 RATNERPRES	7590 08/09/2007		EXAMINER	
P O BOX 980			DESAI, ANAND U	
VALLEY FOR	GE, PA 19482-0980		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/550,923	SHASTRI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Anand U. Desai, Ph.D.	1656				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	ne correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply b will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e, cause the application to become ABAND	ION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov	ember 9, 2006.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	•					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-47 are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	, ,,,	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	its have been received. Its have been received in Applic prity documents have been received. Bu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	л П					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/550,923

Art Unit: 1656

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-25, drawn to a construct comprising a polymeric matrix and a nanoparticle. Group II, claim(s) 26-40, drawn to a method of presenting biological information to a cell or a tissue.

Group III, claim(s) 41-42, drawn to a method of making a construct.

Group IV, claim(s) 43-46, drawn to a nanoparticle comprising a structure, a monomolecular layer of hydroxyapatite, and optionally a monomolecular layer of poly(acrylic acid) and/or a monomolecular layer of collagen.

Group V, claim(s) 47, drawn to a method of administering a nanoparticle to a cell.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature linking groups I-V appears to be that they all relate to a construct comprising a polymeric matrix and a nanoparticle dispersed in the polymeric matrix. However, Oppenheim et al. (U.S. Patent 4,107,288) teach a particle that comprises a biologically or pharmacodynamically active material supported on or incorporated into the crosslinked matrix (see claims 16, and 17). Therefore, the technical feature linking the

Art Unit: 1656

inventions of groups I-V does not contribute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art. Accordingly, groups I-V are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Reminder of Potential Rejoinder under in Ochiai/Brouwer Situation

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double

Application/Control Number: 10/550,923

Art Unit: 1656

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anand U. Desai, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Art Unit: 1656

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Kathleen Kerr Bragdon can be reached on (517) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 3, 2007

AD
/Anand Desai/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1656